

Remarks

Claims 1-65 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. By this paper, claims 3, 4, 6, 17, 18, 20, 27, 28, 42, 44, 45, and 50 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13-16, 19, 25, 29-36, 39, 41, 43, 51-55, and 57-65 have been amended.

Claim 61 was objected to because of a dependency problem. The applicant has amended claim 61 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claims 1-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Alexander et al. ("Alexander"). As amended, independent claim 1 recites "associating each of a plurality of functions of an interactive television system with a room identifier corresponding to a physical room in a home." Alexander discloses an electronic programming guide that displays a list of television programs and advertising. Alexander, however, does not teach or suggest a function that is associated with a room identifier corresponding to a physical room. Alexander has no teaching or discussion of a physical environment external to its interactive program guide.

Claim 1 further recites "displaying an interactive menu displaying the plurality of room identifiers." Alexander does not disclose or suggest an interactive menu that displays a plurality of room identifiers.

Claim 1 is further distinguishable over Kemink et al. ("Kemink"). Kemink discloses a location-dependent remote control to receive context-sensitive information, modify its user interface based on the context sensitive information, and

remotely control appliances through user commands. Abstract, column 2, line 55 to column 3, line 54, and column 3, line 61 to column 4, line 20.

By contrast, the claimed invention is related to a user interface that is customized by associating features with rooms in a home. Page 7, lines 18-22. This advantageously provides a user interface that is simple to understand, navigate, and operate, because the features have a natural association with physical locations. The present application does not disclose using a remote control device to operate different features and appliances in various physical locations and rooms. Thus, the remote control device is not dependent on location and does not remotely operate various appliances.

Claim 1 recites "in response to the function being selected, executing the function within the interactive television system rather than the corresponding physical room." The function is executed only in the context of the interactive television system, not in the physical room. By associating interactive television functions with rooms in a home where those functions have a natural association (e.g., an "electronic recipe book" with a "kitchen"), users will be able to easily locate the functions.

Kemink does not disclose "executing the function within the interactive television system rather than the corresponding physical room," as claimed. In fact, Kemink teaches away from this limitation because his remote control device is to operate appliances in the actual, physical locations. Accordingly, claim 1 represents patentable subject matter over Kemink.

An anticipation under section 102 is proper only if the reference shows exactly what is claimed. MPEP § 2131. Because Alexander and Kemink do not disclose all limitations of claim 1, they cannot anticipate claim 1. Independent claims 13, 14, 15, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, and 41 are amended to include similar limitations and likewise represent patentable subject matter. Depending claims 2, 7-12, 16, 19, 21-26, and 36-40 include all limitations of their respective independent claims and thus represent patentable subject matter as well.

Claims 43-51 and 55-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kemink. Independent claim 43 recites "the set top box capable of executing a feature based on a received and interpreted command signal indicative of a selected feature, the executed feature occurring within the interactive television system rather than the corresponding room." Claim 43 is directed to a user interface, not to a system to remotely control operations throughout a home. Similar to the discussion above, Kemink does not disclose a set top box that executes a function that occurs in the interactive television system rather than the physical room corresponding to the function. Kemink's use of a set-top box is to remotely control appliances in the different rooms:

In another example, the video control device 100 may be a set-top box, wherein the user interface 110 includes an interface to a television. In this embodiment, the user of this device may view the status of all the controllable appliances in the house from a distance, and control each of these appliances using a hand-held remote, or by using voice commands.

Kemink, column 10, lines 62-67 (emphasis added). There is no teaching or suggestion in Kemink of associating a feature with a room in a home, an interactive

menu displaying a room identifier and associated features, and activating the feature that does not occur in the room. Indeed, Kemink teaches away from this limitation.

Independent claims 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, and 65 include similar limitations and likewise represent patentable subject matter. Dependant claims 43, 46-49, 51, 55-57, 59, and 61 include all limitations of their respective independent claims.

Claims 52-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemink. Claims 52-54 depend from independent claim 43, which has been distinguished from Kemink. Accordingly, claims 52-54 represent patentable subject matter.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 7-16, 19, 21-26, 29-41, 43, 46-49, and 51-65 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims herein is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Digeo, Inc.

By


Kory D. Christensen
Registration No. 43,548

STOEL RIVES LLP
One Utah Center Suite 1100
201 S Main Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111-4904
Telephone: (801) 328-3131
Facsimile: (801) 578-6999